A COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO CONDITIONALS IN MOROCCAN ARABIC

Abdelhakim Boubekri

Mohamed V University, Rabat, Morocco

ABSTRACT

This study describes conditional constructions in Moroccan Arabic (henceforth MA) using a cognitive approach. Adopting the typology of conditional constructions suggested by Dancygier (1999) and Dancygier & Sweetser (2005), this study examines conditional constructions that are introduced by the particles īla (إلا), lūkān (لوكـــــان), ūkakān (وككـــــان), kūn (كـــون), kānkūn (كـــــانكون), ūkān (وكـــــان). MA has the three main categories that exist in English, namely predictive conditionals, non-predictive conditionals, and generic conditionals. However, unlike English, MA has just eight sub-types. The two types which do not exist in MA are Elliptical conditionals and the absence of the distinction between weak and strong predictive conditionals. The two belong to one type called distanced predictive conditionals. MA conditionals are introduced by either īla or kūn. The main distinction between the two lies in the attitude the speaker has toward the fulfillment of the propositions expressed in the construction. Concerning, non-distanced predictive conditionals, both conjunctions are used except for speech act conditionals. Verb forms reveal the position the speaker holds toward the fulfillment of the proposition in the different conditional types. Finally, a generic conditional category in MA behaves in a different way than it does in English. While it can refer to both present and past in English, it seems that it is independent of time in MA. Hence, we cannot use adverbs of time with a generic conditional.

KEYWORDS: *Perfective, Imperfective, Predictive, Non-Predictive, Generic Conditionals*

INTRODUCTION

Conditional constructions manifest the cognitive power of humans to examine miscellaneous situations and to infer consequences on the basis of known or hypothetical conditions. It has been assumed that mostly all languages have a way to form conditional sentences; therefore conditionals do exist in natural languages of the world if not all. Classical Greek, German, Standard Arabic, Latin, Chinese, Japanese are examples of natural languages in which conditional constructions do exist (Traugott, 1986). This study describes conditional constructions in Moroccan Arabic using a cognitive approach. Adopting the typology of conditional constructions suggested by (Dancygier (1999) Dancygier& Sweetser (2005), this study examines conditional constructions that are introduced by the particles īla (إلا), lūkān (لوكـان), ūkakān (وككـان), kūn (كون), kānkūn (كـانكون), ūkān (وكان). All of these conjunctions are equivalent to "if" and play the same role "if" does in English. The choice of which conjunction to use depends on which part of Morocco the speaker belongs to. For instance, Fasi people use ūkakān (وككـان), while Casawi people use kūn (كون) and lūkān (لوكـان). Therefore, I will limit myself to the use of īla (إلا) and kūn (كون) since they are the most used ones all over Morocco.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Conditional constructions are marked by their multi-faceted nature which makes it quite difficult to provide a definition that can hold for the full range of conditional usages. Accordingly, Declerck & Reed(2001, p.8)state that "the number of criteria that can be used to categorize conditionals and the number of ensuing types and subtypes is so large that we have found it impossible to identify a genuine common denominator". Likewise, Wierzbicka (1997, p. 54) claims that "the meaning of the English word condition is semantically more complex than that of [the lexical primitive] IF". Even more, as indicated by Declerck and Reed (2001, p.8), the view that a conditional clause is a subordinate clause, and thus syntactically and semantically dependent on a 'main clause', is not very practical. For one reason, there are paratactic conditionals like *Do it and/or I'll beat you*. For another, the sort of semantic dependency of an if-clause on its main clause may vary considerably.

The only form that gains a clear agreement among researchers to represent conditionals is the one referred to as *If p, (then) q* (Comrie, 1986; Dancygier, 2003; Evans & Over, 2004). Dancygier (1998, p.1), following traditional grammarians, defines "conditionals" as "the sentences so labelled by grammarians (rather than logicians): complex sentences; composed of the main clause (sometimes also called q or the apodosis) and a subordinate clause (p, or the apodosis). The subordinate clause is introduced by a conjunction, the least marked of English conditional conjunction being if". Likewise, Bennett (2003) describes a conditional sentence as a sentence that embraces two clauses: the main clause and the subordinate clause. The latter is introduced by a conditional conjunction. In English, conditional constructions are introduced by *if*, *unless* and a few other conjunctions. From the above definitions, we can say that a conditional sentence is characterized by the unassertiveness of its propositions, contains two clauses: a main clause and a subordinate clause, the subordinate clause is introduced by a conjunction such as *if* and *unless* in English, *ʔin 'if'* (no counterfactual) and *law 'if'* (counterfactual) in Standard Arabic, and *jodi 'if'* and with a conditional, non-finite verb form –*le* in Bengali.

Several parameters are suggested by Comrie (1986) to describe conditional constructions in human languages, including clause order, marking of conditionality, degrees of hypotheticality and time reference. The most important factors are the last two: hypotheticality and time reference. Hypotheticality is defined by Comrie (1986: 88) as "the degree of probability of realization of the situations referred to in the conditional and more especially in the protasis." Languages show different degrees of hypotheticality along a continuum with no clear divisions (ibid). The speaker evaluates the degree of hypotheticality of the proposition, and then he chooses the conditional type accordingly (ibid). In English conditionals, degrees of hypotheticality are expressed using different tenses (past, present, and future) and models (would or any other modal) (Chou, 2000). The three-way distinction (past/present/future) is maintained in conditionals with low hypotheticality. The present/future distinction is neutralized in the protasis, while it is retained in the apodosis. In conditionals with greater hypotheticality, however, the present/future distinction is neutralized in both the protasis and apodosis.

The well-known typology of conditional constructions is the tripartite system based on the degree of the factuality of the events encoded in each of the two clauses (Johnson-laird 1986; Comrie, 1986; Natalia, 2012). The tripartite system includes three key terms as Taylor (1997, pp. 301-302) listed. 1) Factual conditionals, also called 'real' or 'realis' (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2005): the content of the if-clause is presumed to be the case. 2) Hypothetical conditionals, also called 'irrealis' (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2005): the content of the if-clause is entertained as a possibility, neither in

accordance with reality not necessarily inconsistent with it. 3) Counterfactual conditionals, also referred to as 'unreal' (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2005): the content of the if-clause is taken to be contrary to fact. This system is the most adopted by most ESL/EFL course books of English, including the Moroccan ones.

MOROCCAN ARABIC CONDITIONALS CLASSIFICATION BASED ON DANCYGIER (1999) AND DANCYGIER AND SWEETSER (2005)

Introduction

The caveat that Comrie's (1986) classification has is that it does not include all conditional types as noted by Dancygier (1998) and Dancygier and Sweetser (2005). They revisit it and suggest a new typology which embraces all conditional constructions as they claim. They adopt mental space theory as a theoretical background claiming that this theory can solve many problems posited by logicians when discussing conditional constructions. They define mental space theory as "a very general formal theory which provides mechanisms for talking about cognitive structures and the connections between them" (ibid, p. 11). Among the problems logicians (Frege, 1893; Jeffrey, 1963; Grice, 1989a) cannot solve is how to account for a sentence like *If pigs had wings, they could fly* using the truth-conditional approach (Wierzbicka, 1997). Adherers of Mental Space Theory argue that an if-clause sets up a mental space which is the background for the construal of the main clause (Dancygier, 1999; Dancygier and Sweetser, 2005). Therefore, in a sentence like *If pigs had wings, they could fly* the if-clause sets up space wherein the pigs had wings and within that space, the speaker predicts that pigs could fly.

Dancygier (1999) and Dancygier & Sweetser (2005) classify conditional constructions on the basis of time-reference and modality, in addition to certain features such as verb forms, clause order, and intonation which correlates with aspects such as the type of reasoning involved, the role of causality, the use of contextual information, the speaker's knowledge, and the perspectives of speaker and hearer. The most important aspects that affect the interpretation of conditionals are verb forms, clause orders, intonation patterns, and the use of different connectives. They come up with three main categories namely generic conditionals, predictive conditionals, non-predictive conditionals.

Predictive conditionals are defined as "somebody predicting something, but only conditionally upon some unrealized events" (Dancygier & Seetser, 2005, p. 28). Using Mental Space Theory, predictive conditionals set up "a correlation of parameters which structures alternative mental spaces" (ibid, p. 32). Via prediction, a speaker invites a hearer to imagine the models of the world that lead the speaker to believe in the correlation underlying that prediction. The role of *if* in conditional constructions is to trigger the set up of a mental space. Predictive conditionals are sub-classified into three types, namely non-distanced predictive conditionals, weak-distanced predictive conditionals, and strong distanced predictive conditionals.

The main distinction between predictive and non-predictive conditionals lies in the fact that the first is marked with backshift while the second is not. Dancygier (1998, p. 37) defines backshift as "the time marked in the verb phrase is earlier than the time actually referred to" (ibid: 37). In addition, tense forms and tense reference in predictive conditionals are stable. However, they are frequently mixed in non-predictive conditionals. Furthermore, the protasis and the apodosis in predictive conditionals have a relation of sequentiality. In contrary, the two clauses of non-predictive conditionals do not have such relation. Finally, non-predictive conditionals are marked by lack of regular verb patterns. This class issub-classified into six types: epistemic conditionals, speech act conditionals, meta-linguistic conditionals, meta-metaphorical conditionals, elliptical conditionals, and meta-spatial conditionals.

The third class of conditionals is called generative prediction which canonically takes the form *IF P-pres, Q-pres*. The present form in the P-clause fulfills the requirement for the background clause of a predictive construction and simultaneously manifests the form usually used in English for generic event reference. In English, simple past forms are possible with generic conditionals. Generic conditionals are predictive due to the fact that "they describe a predictive relationship between a state of affairs in P and the causally dependent state of affairs in Q, over a generic class of mental spaces" (ibid, p. 95).

In light of this classification, this study deals with conditional constructions in Moroccan Arabic. It examines conditionals that are introduced by the conjunctions īla (إلا) and kūn (كون). As mentioned above, these two conjunctions are equivalent to if in English. All the if-conditional types listed by Dancygier and Dancygier and Sweetser exist in Moroccan Arabic. In the following sections, I introduce the if-conditional types exist in Moroccan Arabic illustrated by examples.

Predictive Conditionals in Moroccan Arabic

Following Dancygier (1999) and Dancygier and Sweetser (2005), I will discuss predictive conditionals with respect to their temporal interpretation and type of modality, as well as the kind of unassertiveness signaled and the relation between the assumptions in *p* and *q.* Consider the following examples:

- īlalaᶜbūmazyanyerabḥū

  If play.PFV.3PL.JUSS. well-ADV win.IPFV.3PL.JUSS

  'If they play well, they will win'

- kūnlaᶜbū, yerabḥū

  If play.PFV.3PL win.PFV.3PL

  'If they played/ had played, they would/could win/ would/could have won'

Sentences (1) and (2) are best examples of predictive conditionals. They represent predictive reasonings, and they are therefore marked with *if*-backshift in the protases. Unlike English, the apodosis in predictive conditionals in Moroccan Arabic does not have a predictive modal. Traditionally, the two examples belong to two classes: real and unreal. Sentence (1) represents real conditionals, while sentence (2) represents unreal ones. While English predictive conditionals are classified on the basis of the temporal reference of verb forms in the protasis and apodosis, MA predictive conditionals are classified on the basis of the aspect form of the verb in the protasis and apodosis in addition to the conjunction used. In sentence (1), the conjunction īla has a future reference in addition to marking conditionality. Therefore, the sentences introduced by this conjunction belong to the non-distanced predictive conditionals. īla cannot be used to refer to the past. In the protasis, the form of the verb is perfective. This marks the distance that the speaker wants to mark towards the prediction in question. In this case, the perfective form indicates that there is less distance towards the prediction expressed in the sentence. That is to say when a speaker says īlalaᶜbūmazyanyerabḥū 'if they play well, they will win', he indicates that the action expressed in the protasis has a great chance to happen. In this sense, he has a positive attitude towards the fulfillment of the proposition expressed in the sentence. To argue for this claim, consider the following example:

- īlayelaᶜbūmazyanyerabḥū

If play.PFV.3PL.JUSS. well-ADV win.IPFV.3PL.JUSS

'If they play well, they will win'

The imperfective form of the verb in this sentence indicates that there is more distance towards the prediction expressed in comparison with the one expressed in the sentence (1). That is to say, when the speaker uses the imperfective form yelaᶜbū, he indicates that the action expressed in the protasis has less chance to happen. Actually, he has a negative attitude towards the fulfillment of the proposition expressed in the sentence. In a nutshell, the perfective form of the verb in sentences introduced by īla indicates prediction as high on the scale of assertability, while the use of the imperfective form indicates it as low.

Likewise, the form of the auxiliary verb whether it is perfective or imperfective decides whether the prediction is high or low on the scale of assertability. Therefore, in example (4a) below, the perfective form of the auxiliary verb kān 'to be' indicates the prediction as high on the scale of assertability. That is to say, the speaker expects Anas to be working. In example (4b), the use of the imperfective form of the auxiliary verb yekūn 'to be' indicates the prediction as low on the scale of assertability. That is to say, the speaker does not expect Anas to be working.

- a. īlakān Anas ḫdām, ġadinšufu

  If be.PFV.3SGM Anas-NOM working.3SGM-ACCU will see.IPFV.3SGM.JUSS

  'If Anas is working, I will see him.'

  b. īlayekūn Anas ḫdām, ġadinšufu

  If be.IPFV.3SGM Anas-NOM working.3SGM-ACCU will. see.IPFV.3SGM.JUSS

  'If Anas is working, I will see him.'

The if-conditional sentences introduced by īla cannot be in the perfective form. It is always in the imperfective form. The assertability of the results expressed in the apodosis is intensified using the conjunction ġadi. That is to say, ġadi indicates that it is very likely for them to win if they play. To illustrate consider example (5a):

- a. īlalaᶜbūmazyanġadiyerabḥū

  If play.PFV.3PL.JUSS. well-ADV will. win.IPFV.3PL.JUSS

  'If they play well, they will win'

  ? b. īlayelaᶜbūmazyanġadiyerabḥū

  If play.PFV.3PL.JUSS. well-ADV will. win.IPFV.3PL.JUSS

  'If they play well, they will win

ġadi can be used to argue for the fact that the use of the imperfective form in the protasis indicates the less chance for the act to happen. That is to say, ġadi is not used in the apodosis when the imperfective form is used in the protasis. This argues for considering sentence (5b) as relatively unacceptable.

Unlike, the conditionals introduced by īla in which the speaker expresses his positive attitude towards the fulfillment of the proposition expressed in the sentence, the speaker in the if-conditional sentences introduced by kūn has a

negative attitude towards the fulfillment of the proposition expressed. Consider the following examples:

- a. kūnlaᶜbū, yerabḥū

  If play.PFV.3PL be.win.PFV.3PL

  'If they had played, they could have won'

  b. kūnyelaᶜbū, kūnyerabḥū

  If play.PFV.3PL be.win.PFV.3PL

  'If they played, they could win'

In sentences (6a) and (6b), the speaker has a negative attitude towards the fulfillment of the propositions expressed. Concerning the verb forms, in the sentence (6a) the use of the perfective form in the protasis indicates that the speaker refers to the past. This is proved by the use of the adverb lbāraḥ 'yesterday' after the verb in the protasis, while the use of the adverbs daba 'now' and ġadda 'tomorrow' after the verb makes us question the grammaticality of the sentence. It also indicates that the prediction is high on the scale of assertability. Furthermore, the use of the perfective shows that the speaker has a neutral position towards the execution of the act. However, the use of the imperfective in the protasis indicates that the speaker refers to the present or the future. This is proved by the use of the adverbs daba 'now' and ġadda 'tomorrow' after the verb in the protasis without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence. It also indicates that the prediction is high on the scale of assertability. Furthermore, the use of the perfective form shows that the speaker has a neutral position towards the execution of the act. While the use of the imperfective form shows that the speaker wishes if the act is performed.

The use of the perfective form in the apodosis of the sentences introduced by kūn is possible. This is conditioned by the use ofkūn 'to be' before the verb. I cannot consider kūn as an auxiliary verb here. This is due to the fact that we cannot use the imperfective form of kūn in this case. The role of if in the clause is to intensify the assertability of the act expressed in the apodosis. Kūn, in this case, means *it is very likely that*. We can also use it before an imperfective verb in the apodosis and it behaves in the same way as the one used before a perfective verb.

Unlike English, in which strong predictive conditionals and weak predictive conditionals are distanced by the use of tense, in MA, these two types can be introduced by the same sentence. Therefore, the sentences introduced by kūn can have two interpretations in terms of the strength or weakness of the prediction. That is to say, sentence (6a) for example may mean 'If they played, they could win', or 'If they had played, they could have won'. It is the context which helps to decide what the speaker means. This leads us to claim that in Moroccan Arabic, there are just two types of predictive conditionals namely non-distanced predictive conditionals introduced by īla and distanced predictive conditionals introduced by kūn.

In general, in the predictive conditional constructions, the sentences introduced by īla represent non-distanced predictive conditionals, while the sentences introduced by kūn represent distanced predictive conditionals without making a distinction between weak and strong distance. The form of the verb whether it is perfective or imperfective indicates whether the prediction is high or low on the scale of assert-ability in the non-distanced predictive conditionals. In distanced predictive conditionals, the choice of the verb form indicates whether a prediction is high or low on the scale of assertability, in addition to indicating time reference. Therefore, we use the perfective form to refer to the past and to

indicate the prediction as high on the scale of assertability. We use the imperfective form to refer to the present and the future and to indicate the prediction as low on the scale of assertability.

Non-Predictive Conditionals in Moroccan Arabic

In Moroccan Arabic, non-predictive conditionals include just five conditional types. Consider the following examples:

- a. īlamša, yelqa Adam faddar

   If go.PFV.3SGM find.IPFV.3SGM.JUSS. Adam. in. the. house

   'If he goes, he will find Adam in the house'

   b. īlayamši, yelqa. Adam faddar

   If go.IPFV.3SGM find.IPFV.3SGM.JUSS. Adam in. the. house

   'If he goes, he will find Adam in the house'

   c. kūnmša, yelqa. Adam faddar

   If go.PFV.3SGM find.IPFV.3SGM.JUSS. Adam. in. the. house

   'If he goes/went/had gone, he will find/would find/ have found Adam in the house'

- a. īla rah Kamal ğay, ḫallih

   If be.PFV.3SGM. Kamal coming. IPFV Let.IPFV.3SGM.JUSS

   'If Kamal is coming, let him'

   b. īla Kamal ğa, qullihyestanna

   If. Kamal. come. PFV tell.IPFV. wait, IPFV. 3SGM.JUSS

   'If he is coming, tell him to wait'

- raḥnaghirsḫabīlakatfham

   be.PFV. 1PL. just. Friends. NOM. If. understand. IPFV

   'We are just friends if you understand'

- īlakūntintahuwaluzīrʔana rani lmalik

   if be. IPFV. you. He. Minister.be. IPFV. DEF. king

   'If you are the minister, I am the king'

- īlakāntdārkumkbar man dārna, chkūnllīkbīrbarṭamt Hicham wallabarṭamt

   if be.PFV. your. house. Bigger. Than. Our. House which. Big. Apartment. Hicham. or. Apartment.

   Anas

   Anas

'If your house is bigger than ours, which is bigger Hicham's apartment or Anas's?

These examples represent the category of non-predictive conditionals in Moroccan Arabic. The first point to raise here is the absence of the elliptical if-conditional type. This is due to the fact that in Moroccan Arabic, the subject is morphologically bounded with verbs, nouns, and adjectives, unlike English where the subject is morphologically independent. That is to say, we cannot eliminate the subject and the verb in Moroccan Arabic. If we do so, we will end up having ungrammatical sentences. However, in English, we can do that without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence. Consider the following examples:

- a. rah hbīlīlamakānš, mqaṭṭaᶜ lurāq

  be. IPFV. 3SGM. Idiot, if. be. IPFV. NEG. tear. PFV. papers

  'He is an idiot, if he is not a jackass'

  *b. rah hbīlīlamqaṭṭaᶜ lurāq

  be. IPFV. 3SGM. Idiot, if. tear. PFV. papers

  'He is an idiot, if not a jackass'

Sentence (12b) shows that if we delete the word makānš 'not to be', the sentence becomes ungrammatical. In general, Moroccan Arabic does not include elliptical if-conditional type.

Like English non-predictive conditionals, the clauses in Moroccan Arabic non-predictive conditionals seem to be temporally independent. They do not require any form of backshift. For instance, in the sentence (7a), the if-clause indicates that the act, if performed, will be performed in the future, while the act in the main clause has been performed before since the person is actually there. Furthermore, the two clauses have no relation to sequentiality. That is to say, if the person mentioned to in the main clause goes, he will find the other one there. If he does not go, the other one will be there anyway. In this sense, the role of if-clause is to motivate a statement in the main clause. To interpret such sentences, we need to see the type of (non-causal) relation between the clauses and the kind of reasoning used in the utterance of such constructions. However, unlike English, non-predictive conditionals category shows regular patterns of verb forms. The verb forms indicate the position the speaker holds towards the utterance. That is to say, in the sentence (7a), the speaker is neutral concerning the realization of the activities performed in the utterance. This is implied by the use of the perfective form in the protasis. However, in the sentence (7b), the speaker is not neutral, instead, he wishes if the act is carried out.This is implied by the use of the imperfective form of the verb in the protasis. The verb forms in the apodosis have the same features they have in predictive conditionals.

Examples (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11) represent epistemic conditionals, speech act conditionals, meta-linguistic conditionals, meta-metaphoric conditionals, and meta-spatial conditionals respectively.

Concerning the Epistemic conditionals, the relation between the protases and apodoses is inferential. In this case the knowledge of p is a sufficient condition for concluding q, for example in sentence (7a) knowing that Adam usually goes home at 5 p.m. and it is 6 p.m. now, therefore, if the person mentioned in the apodosis goes now, the speaker infers that he will find Adam in the house. We can test our conclusion by using the test bittaʔkīd 'surely'. So, īlamša, bittaʔkīdyelqa Adam faddar 'If he goes, he will surely find Adam in the house'.

At the level of speech act relations, if-clauses can bear a relationship to the speech act performed in the main clause rather than to its propositional content. In this type of sentences, the protasis are said to guarantee a successful performance of the speech act in the apodoses. Sentence (8b) is a good example. In this case, if he does not come, you will not have the chance to tell him to wait. Therefore, the performance of telling him to wait is guaranteed by his coming. In this example, the speaker performs a request in uttering the if-conditional sentence. In this type, īla is the only conjunction used. Therefore, we cannot produce a speech act if-conditional in Moroccan Arabic using kūn, hence the ungrammaticality of example (13).

- * kūn Kamal ǧa, qullihyestanna

    If. Kamal. come. PFV tell.IPFV. wait, IPFV. 3SGM.JUSS

    'If he is coming, tell him to wait

Meta-linguistic conditionals use comments on a part of the text of the previous utterance, objecting to it in any of its aspects, including its contribution to propositional content. Its function is realized in the conditional form. In sentence (9), the speaker uses the if-clause to comment on the proposition used in the mainclause. Unlike, speech act conditionals, meta-linguistic conditionals can use both īla and kūn, hence the grammaticality of example (14). The difference between the two lies in the attitude towards the proposition expressed in the if-clause. Therefore, in the sentence (14), the speaker negates the understanding from the part of the addressee. However, in a sentence (9), the speaker questioning whether the speaker understands what he says.

- raḥnaghirsḫabkūnkatfham

    be.PFV. 1PL. just. Friends. NOM. If. understand. IPFV

    'We are just friends if you understand'

Meta-metaphorical conditionals are called so because they express a relationship between metaphorical mappings. Sentence (10) represents well this type. In this example, a metaphorical relationship between two domains, namely the minister, and king, is established and developed. What interferes in the choice of verb forms –perfective or imperfective- is the speaker's assumption towards the realization of the proposition. Therefore, if he uses the perfective form, then he assumes it to be the case. If he uses the imperfective form he assumes it will be the case. In this sentence, the speaker uses the perfective form in the apodosis. Therefore, he assumes that he is better than the addressee by comparing between the minister and the king. If he uses the imperfective form, then he assumes that he will be better than the addressee in the future. The speaker can compare himself with the addressee using the past reference. This is possible using the conjunction kūn plus the auxiliary kūnt 'to be' in both the protasis and the apodosis as in example (15). In this case, the speaker aims to use an extreme case in which he is better than the addressee by imaging a strong distanced prediction.

- kūnkūntintahuwaluzīrkūnkūntanahuwalmalik

    if be. IPFV. you. He. Minister.be. IPFV. DEF. king

    'If you are the minister, I am the king'

Meta-spatial conditionals are another type of non-predictive conditionals. In this type, "the protasis seems to be setting up a background mental space, even if that space-negotiation process does not fall into one of the categories"

(Dancygier& Sweetser, 2005, p.136) of conditionals. A good example of this category is the construction (11) above. The conditional in this example might be paraphrased as something like: if your house would be bigger than mine, then I'd like to know which would be bigger Hicham's apartment or Anas's apartment. It sets up a number of different types of spaces. In the base space, the speaker constructs an assumed correlation between the size of the speaker's house and the addressee's house and the size of Hicham's apartment and Anas's apartment. With that correlation as a premise, the addressee can guess (conclude) which is bigger his house or the addresses one. But the conclusion still involves a choice (*Hicham's apartment or Anas's apartment*), so a question clarifying it is the final (speech-act) step in the configuration of spaces. The mental-space set-up also evokes a contextual assumption concerning the irrationality of the addressee which is responsible for the sarcastic tone of the remark.

Generic Conditionals

The third category of if-conditional predictions is called generative prediction which canonically takes the form *IF P-pres, Q-pres in English*. In Moroccan Arabic, it canonically takes the form *īla PFV, ka IPFV*. Consider the following example:

- a. īlalᶜab, kayarbaḥ.

     If play.PFV.3SGM ka. Win.IPFV.3SGM. JUSS

     'If he plays, he wins'

   *b. kūnlᶜab, kayarbaḥ.

     If play.PFV.3SGM ka. Win.IPFV.3SGM. JUSS

     'If he plays, he wins'

In sentences such as (16a), the P-clause fulfills the requirement for the background clause of a predictive construction and simultaneously manifests the form usually used in Moroccan Arabic for generic event reference. Generic conditionals in Moroccan Arabic refer to no time. The generic category is then independent of time. This is proved by the fact that if we use the adverbs lbarḥ `yesterday', daba 'now', or ġadda 'tomorrow' with a sentence (16a), it becomes ungrammatical. kūn is not possible, hence the ungrammaticality of sentence (16b). Generic conditionals are predictive due to the fact that "for any given mental space, if P is known to obtain, then the eventuality with respect to Q will be predictable" (ibid, p. 95).

CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, unlike English which contains ten if-conditional types, Moroccan Arabic contains just eight. The two types which do not exist in Moroccan Arabic are Elliptical conditionals and the absence of the distinction between weak and strong predictive conditionals. The two belong to one type called distanced predictive if-conditional. The main distinction between īla and kūn lies in the attitude the speaker has toward the fulfillment of the propositions expressed in the construction. Therefore, if the construction is introduced by īla, the speaker then has a positive attitude towards the fulfillment of its proposition. If the construction is introduced by kūn, then the speaker has a negative attitude towards the fulfillment of its propositions. The distinction between the two also lies in the fact that the constructions introduced by īla represent non-distanced predictive conditionals, while the constructions introduced by kūn represent distanced predictive conditionals without making a distinction between weak and strong distance. Verb forms play a

crucial role in terms of assertability. Thus, the perfective form of the verb indicates the prediction as high, while imperfective form indicates the prediction as low in non-distanced predictive conditional constructions. The same generalization is true for distanced predictive conditionals constructions, in addition to indicating time reference. Hence, the perfective form refers to the past, while the imperfective form refers to the present and the future. The verb form plays another role. It reveals the position the speaker holds toward the fulfillment of the proposition. Thus, if he uses the perfective form, he takes a neutral position. However, if he uses the imperfective form, therefore he wishes if the proposition is held.

REFERENCES

1. *Bennett, J. F. (2003). A philosophical guide to conditionals. Clarendon Press Oxford.*

2. *Chou, C.-L. (2000). Chinese speakers' acquisition of English conditionals: Acquisition order and L1 transfer effects. University of Hawai'I Second Langauge Studies Paper 19 (1).*

3. *Comrie, B. (1986). Conditionals: a typology. In E. C. Traugott, A. Ter Meulen, J. S. Reilly & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), On conditionals (pp. 77-99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

4. *Dancygier, B. (1999). Conditionals and Prediction: Time, Knowledge, and Causation in Conditional Constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486463*

5. *Dancygier, B., & Sweetser, E. (2005). Mental Spaces in Grammar: Conditional Constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486760*

6. *Declerck, R., & Reed, S. (2001). Conditionals: a comprehensive empirical analysis. Berlin ; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). The grammar book. Boston: Heinle&Heinle.*

7. *Evans, J., & Over, D. (2004). If. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

8. *Frege, G. (1893). Grundgesetze der Aritmetik, begriffsschriftlichabgeleitet, Vol. 1. Jena: H. Pohle, 1st edn.*

9. *Grice, HP (1989a). "Indicative Conditionals." In Studies in the Way of Words, chap. 4, 58-85. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.*

10. *Khalid Elasri, A Linguistic and Cultural Analysis of Sympathy, Compassion, Empathy and Pity in English and Moroccan Arabic, International Journal of Linguistics and Literature (IJLL), Volume 7, Issue 4, June-July 2018, pp. 81-90*

11. *Jeffrey, R. C. (1963). 'On Indeterminate Conditionals'. Philosophical Studies 14(3): pp. 37–43.*

12. *Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1986). Conditionals and mental models. In E. C. Traugott, A. Ter Meulen, J. S. Reilly & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), On conditionals (pp. 55-76). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

13. *Natalia, D. J. (2012). Applying Cognitive Linguistic and Task-Supported Language Teaching to Instruction of English Conditional Phrases. Unpublished Doctoral thesis. Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA.*

14. *Taylor, J. (1997). Conditionals and polarity. In A. Athanasiadou, & R. Dirven (Eds.), On conditionals again (pp. 289-306). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.*

15. *Traugott, E. C. (Ed.). (1986). On conditionals. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.*

16. *Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Conditionals and counterfactuals: conceptual primitives and linguistic universals. In Athanasiadou, A. & Dirven, R. (Eds.), On conditionals again (pp. 15-62). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.*